



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

conjecture. van Herwerden is sufficiently inclined to accept Cobet's suggestions, as is shown by nearly every page of his edition; but in this case he has not been convinced. For in Mnem. XI 59, in an article entitled 'Paralipomena Thucydidea,' he calls attention to many oversights and errors which he now detects in his edition, but he passes over without notice the advice of his master in this particular. And yet there is one respect—not insisted upon, however, by Prof. Humphreys—in which the reading *ἐκρατήθησαν* would have a great advantage over the active form; for the active requires us to render *οὐκ ἂν ἐτειχίσαντο* *munire non potuissent*, instead of *non munivissent*. Mehlhorn pointed out (in Jahrb. IX 403) this difficulty, and proposed a way of his own¹ to get rid of it. The renderings given in the notes rather evade than surmount it; for example, this of Shilleto's: "'it is obvious they did win the battle, for else they would not have,' etc., *i. e.* without a victory they would not have been in a position to intrench themselves behind a rampart"; or this of Krüger's: "*sie hätten das Lager nicht befestigt*, wären daran gehindert worden." However, it must be recognized that *ἂν* can be used with the past tenses in Greek where, as Aken, T. u. M. §72, expresses it, "keine Nichtwirklichkeit, sondern nur eine Möglichkeit der Vergangenheit, ausgesprochen ist," even in cases where the subject is perfectly definite. As an example not quoted by him or by Bäumlein, Modi, p. 148, may be cited Dem. 9, 13: *εἰτ' οἷεσθ' αὐτόν, οἱ ἐποίησαν μὲν οὐδὲν ἂν κακόν, μὴ παθεῖν δ' ἐφύλαξαντ' ἂν ἰσως, τούτους μὲν ἐξασπατᾶν αἰρεῖσθαι μᾶλλον κτέ.*, where *ἐποίησαν ἂν* must be rendered 'could have done.' Compare also Thuc. VI 2, 4.

C. D. MORRIS.

TWO PAPERS BY KARL BRUGMANN.

These two papers are reprints from the Transactions of the Saxon Academy. They were read by Leskien for K. Brugmann in 1883. They treat of several interesting matters, of which only one can be here spoken of in detail. The first and longest is on the Gr. *ἄρα*, *ἄρ*, *ῥα*, and the ostensible purpose of the essay is to show that the Greek particles are identical in function and probably in origin with the Lithuanian *ir*. A very clear scheme of the uses of these particles is given, and ample citations are made from Greek and Lithuanian, which seem to show a correspondence in use so remarkable that it is strange that a suggestion of their kinship should not have been made before, which, it may be inferred from Brugmann's language, has not been done. In cases like *ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας*, and *τοιοῦ ἄρα Τρώων ἡγήτορες ἦντ' ἐπὶ πύργῳ*, where Brugmann represents that the particle adds on no new thought, but merely shows that what has been detailed before is repeated in brief, he knows only one similar instance of the employment of *ir*, but this, he says, is unmistakable. The development of the uses of *ἄρα* does not differ essentially from that elaborated by Heller in Philol. XIII and Nägelsbach, and in regard to the origin of the particles Br. adheres to their old connection with the root of *ἀραρίσκω*. As to their phonetic connection, Br. manifests a truly scientific resolution to advance not one step beyond what facts warrant. Though all the examples cited have shown that *ἄρα*, *ἄρ*, *ῥα* are absolutely destitute of functional difference, it must not be

¹ He says that the parenthesis has relation not to what precedes, but to what follows, understanding *εἰ ἐχρήσαντο πάσῃ τῇ δυνάμει*. This view, however, has been abundantly refuted.

assumed without proof that $\acute{\alpha}\rho$ is a shortened form of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$: and though it is conceivable that $\acute{\alpha}\rho'$ before vowels might give rise to $\acute{\alpha}\rho$ before consonants, still we must remember that the crystallized forms $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ are of very high antiquity. Similarly that $\rho\alpha$ has arisen on Greek ground from $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ is not capable of proof; for the former is always enclitic, and the throwing off of initial $\acute{\alpha}$ is not consonant with Greek euphonic laws.

The next essay is on the use of Sanscr. पुरा and Greek $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ with the present indicative. In the I. E. languages the present tense is employed to express not only facts present at the time of the speaker, but also facts which may be past or future, or may occur at any time. This wide use of this tense is quite primitive. The historical present does not arise from the speaker's bringing for lively effect a past event into his own time; rather in his interest in the fact he loses sight of the interval of time which separates him from the event, and sees it in progress before him; and accordingly this use depends on the essential timelessness of the tense. It was only in comparatively late times that it was consciously employed as a rhetorical means of emphatic expression. So the use of the present for the future is not due to a lively anticipation of a certain future event, but, a point of future time being defined by some other word or phrase in the sentence, the present expresses what is contemporaneous with that; or in oracular statements the future is seen as actually present to the speaker. The high antiquity of the timeless use of the present is seen in the fact that we find $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ in Greek and पुरा in Sanscr. used with a present, where we might expect the imperfect; and therefore these particles fulfil the same functions as the augment. This use must not be explained as if it were in fact a result of *breviloquentia*; as if, that is, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\zeta\alpha\chi\rho\eta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ were a compression of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\zeta\alpha\chi\rho\eta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\theta\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\nu\upsilon\nu$ $\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$. The fact that Homer nowhere uses the histor. pres., or the present for the past, except in connection with such a particle, is due to the Greek epic style, which forbade a narrator to pass out of the proper limits of the time; and by the addition of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ the essentially timeless present loses its character and is placed in the proper relation to the narrator. In four of the Vedic passages cited *sma* is added to पुरा . It is probable that, the use of the two particles together being frequent, gradually *sma* came to be used alone with the same effect, just as in French *pas*, *point*, *plus*, can now in certain conditions stand for *ne-pas*, etc.

The next paper is on the so-called Relative time-grade. This is mainly a polemic against G. Mahlow, who in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* 26 has constructed for the primitive speech a table of 16 tenses, different in form and meaning, of which several express not absolute time, but time past or future relatively to the time of the speaker. Br. thinks that this is all groundless hypothesis; that the only language of our family which has synthetic forms to express relative time is the Latin in its pluperfect and future perfect tenses, and that these were developed by the Latin after its isolation; and that this development was due to the assumption into the sphere of the Latin perfect of the *s*-aorist forms like *dixi*, of which, since they were felt to be real preterites, the past in *eram* would naturally come to represent a pre-past action.

The last discussion in these papers is on the prepositions $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. The question was asked long ago why the Greeks did not, like the Romans, con-

tent themselves with one preposition to express both *in* and *into*. And inscriptions show that about half of the Greek dialects know only *ἐν* used with both cases, as Pindar often has *ἐν* with the acc. Did then these dialects originally possess both *εἰς* and *ἐν* and afterward give up the former? This is the opinion of Ahrens, Kuhn, and G. Meyer, who think that *ἐν* with the acc. is really an *ἐνς* which has lost its *ς*. But such a loss of *ς* is against the phonetic laws of these dialects, and one can see no reason why, if they ever had it, they should not have kept it as the others did. The opposite opinion of Matthäi, E. G. Schmidt, and Meister, that *ἐνς* is the ground-form not only of *εἰς* with the acc. but of *ἐν* with the dat. is equally unsatisfactory. For one cannot understand why, for instance, in Attic out of an assumed *ἐνς ἱερῶ* an *εἰς ἱερῶ* could not have come, as out of *ἐνς ἱερὸν* did come *εἰς ἱερὸν*. All that remains for us is to assume with Pott that originally *ἐν* like Latin *in* was used with both cases, and that *ἐνς* was a special innovation on Greek ground adopted in some dialects to express *into*. For outside of Greek there is no trace of a form answering to *ἐνς* alongside of *ἐν*. Nor are there any traces that the dialects which used *εἰς* ever had an *ἐν* meaning *into*. For the suggestion of Silberstein that such phrases as *ἐμβαίνειν εἰς ναῦν* contain such an indication is of no weight; for they arise rather by mixture of *ἐμβαίνειν νηϊ* with *εἰσβαίνειν εἰς ναῦν*, the relation between the locative or the locative with *ἐν* and the acc. of aim with *εἰς* being as close as in the German *sich auf einer Bank setzen* and *sich auf eine Bank setzen*. Before proceeding to explain the origin of the *ς* it is worth while to examine the forms which *ἐνς* took. No doubt *ἐνς* was the original, which we have evidence existed in the Cretan and Argive dialects. From this came by so-called compensatory change *εἰς*. It is assumed that *ἐς* also came from *ἐνς*, but as yet no account of the process has been given. The two forms *εἰς* and *ἐς* exist side by side both in inscriptions and in the authors; and since *ἐς* is quite frequent in Homer and *εἰς* occurs in the latest period of Attic, it cannot be inferred that *ἐς* is a development of *εἰς* in the same way as *ἐτέλεσα* is of *ἐτέλεσσα* or *τίθησι* of *τίθητι*: for then the later form would have crowded out the parent one. The forms are rather sisters; and the distinction may have arisen from the use of *ἐνς*=*εἰς* before vowels (as *εἰς αὐτοῖς*), and of *ἐνς*=*ἐς* before explosive consonants and spirants (as *ἐς τοῦτους*), just as *κεστός* comes from *κενστός*, and *σύστασις* from *σύνστασις*. This difference of function, however, was not maintained, and one or the other prevailed in accordance with taste or fashion; though in some consecrated phrases *ἐς* was invariably used, as *ἐς κόρακας*, *ἐς μακαρίαν*, etc.

To come now to the form *ἐνς*, may we, as many do, regard it as a development of *ἐνί*, constructing for this purpose an original *ἐνις*? This assumption is based on the belief, held by Curtius and Christ, that *ἐν* is shortened from *ἐνί*. But of this there is no probability. Only *εἰν* and *εἰνί* are legitimate outgrowths of *ἐνί*, resulting from the semi-consonant character of *ι*, just as the form *ὑπεῖρ* comes from *ὑπεργ* corresponding to the Sanscr. *upáry* before vowels. By no phonetic law can *ἐν* be derived from *ἐνί*, for the assumed readiness of final *ι* to drop off has no existence, and all supposed instances of it are to be otherwise explained. We must assume then that *ἐνί* and *ἐν* are proethnic sisters, corresponding one to the Indian *dñi-ka-*, *nī-nī*, the other to the Latin *in*, which means *in* and *into* and shows no traces of loss of *ι*.

What then is the origin of the ς in $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$? There are two views. 1. That of Bopp, Pott, Benfey, and Grassmann that ς is to be identified with the $\sigma\epsilon$ of $\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\sigma\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\sigma\epsilon$, etc. This would answer excellently for the meaning; but the loss of the final ϵ is inexplicable. 2. The view more generally prevalent now, though Br. does not know who first suggested it, that the ς is the same as the final sound in $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$, $\acute{\alpha}\psi$, Lat. *ex*, *abs*, *cis*. But here comes the question why $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ should take this ς only in the sense of *into*, particularly as it is most probable that it is the same as the gen.-abl. suffix of several declensions in Sanscrit. This suffix would be well adapted to reinforce the inherent meaning of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ and *ab*, just as in German *aus* is reinforced by *fort* or *weg*; and besides it gives an ablative meaning to words which by themselves have no such sense; as Sans. *ni* 'in' is made into *nīs* 'from within,' and the Latin *sus* in *susque deque*, *uscipio* from *sub*, and the Greek $\acute{\upsilon}\psi\mu$, $\acute{\upsilon}\psi\omicron\varsigma$ from $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}$. Notwithstanding this difficulty, which has thrown back some investigators, as Clemm, upon the $\sigma\epsilon$ -hypothesis, Br. believes that the ς of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ is the same ς as in $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$, *abs*, arising however at a time when the real force of the ς had dropped out of mind, and $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ were fully identical; the addition of it to $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ being due to the fact that the notions of *into* and *out from* were constantly associated in the consciousness as regular opposites. Many examples are given of similar formations due to regular association, of which a few may be cited. *Thither* is made from $\beta\alpha$ to answer to *hither* fr. *hi*. Old Latin *uls* = *ultra* answers to *cis* = *citra*. If *uls* had been primitive it should have become *ul*, as *sōl* comes from *sōls*. Κατά from κατ (κάββαλε) answers to ἀνά, and κάτω to ἄνω. Ὀπίθεν (κατόπιον) became ὀπισθεν after πρόσθεν and ὀπίσσω after πρόσσω = προτιώ. Ἐμποδών after ἐκποδών, from ἐκ ποδών. Late Latin *sinexter* = *sinister* after *dexter*, *meridionalis* after *meridialis* after *septentrionalis*, *noctu* after *diu*, *nocturnus* after *diurnus*; for there is no sign of a stem *noctu* in pre-Italian times. In dialectic German, *heut morgend* after *heut abend*. Δεδειπναμεν in Comic Fragments after ἀρίστημεν like ἔσταμεν. Old Latin *ningulus* after *singulus*, and perh. in Eng. *nill he* after *will he*. In Sans. *sukha* 'happiness' after *duḥkha* 'misfortune.' Κρείσσων and μείζων, alongside of the Dor. and Ion. κρέσσων and μέζων, cannot be phonetically formed from κρετιών, μεζιων, but the *ει* of κρείσσων is due to its opposite χείρων and that of μεζιων to ὀλειζων, for this is the form confirmed by Inscr. and ὀλίζων a late development after ὀλλίγος. The Ital. *grave* from *gravis* 'heavy,' has its *e* from its opposite *leve*. So ἡμεῖς is for ἡμεῖς after ὑμεῖς. It is not only the logical relation which produces such transformation, but the tendency to use such words in pairs, and the fondness for rhyming sounds.

It has been assumed that at the time when $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ was formed after the analogy of $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ the ς had lost its significance, but the functional difference of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$, whereby $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ was employed before consonants and $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ before vowels, was not yet in force. For we find in some dialects $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ used before consonants till a comparatively late period; and thus as $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ arose at a time when $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ could be used before both vowels and consonants, we may assume that for a certain time $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ existed side by side with the meaning *into*. But since the two forms gave an easy means of marking the difference between *in* and *into*, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ gradually lost its power of expressing direction towards. Finally $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is evidently a pro-ethnic formation = Lat. *intus*. But as $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ has no analogue in any sister language we may assume that it too was formed after $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$.

C. D. MORRIS.